

Application No.: 10/584,825
Filing Date.: June 26, 2006

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 27 are canceled without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter contained therein. Applicants maintain that the cancellation of a claim makes no admission as to its patentability and reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of the canceled claim in this or any other patent application.

Claims 8, 10, 11, 13-17 and 20-23 are amended herein. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, such as page 26, line 2 through page 27, line 17.

Upon entry of the amendment, Claims 8-26 are pending.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected Claims 1- 9, contending that the meaning of “ultrasonic” in Claim 1 is unclear. Applicants have canceled claims 1-7 and have amended Claim 8, which does not recite the objected-to term, to independent form. Therefore, this rejection is moot.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-11 and 13-27 as being obvious over Akazawa in view of Hammann. In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, there must be a reasonable expectation of success found in the prior art. Additionally, the prior art references must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. Applicants submit that the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. Thus, all claims are non-obvious over the cited art.

Neither reference teaches of a base material comprising a filler. Neither reference teaches of a base material comprising a filler comprising at least one of a colorant, a pigment, a dye, gold, copper, platinum and silver and at least one of choroid particles and carbon particles. Further, neither reference teaches of a base material comprising a filler, wherein said filler is 2-20 wt % of the weight of the base material. The filler is a material added in order to control the protective properties of the protective sheet. For example, the filler can be used for keeping the light transmissivity in laser beam absorption region at less than 50%, keeping the etching rate at 0.4 or more, heightening the extinction coefficient of base material, heightening the tensile strength of base material, or heightening the refractive index of base material. Neither reference teaches the desirability of such properties, much less controlling such properties. Thus, one of

Application No.: 10/584,825
Filing Date.: June 26, 2006

ordinary skill would not have been lead by the references, alone or combined, to incorporate filler into a sheet in order to arrive at the claimed methods. Accordingly, neither reference, nor a combination thereof, renders the presently claimed methods obvious.

Applicants further note that the cited references do not teach additional elements from a plurality of the dependent claims. It has not been established that these elements are inherent in the cited art. General disclosure of materials, without more, is insufficient to establish these elements as inherently present in the references. For example, the density of a polyimide film can vary depending upon additional materials added to the film and the extent of curing.

The cited references do not inherently or expressly disclose that the base material extinction coefficient at an ultraviolet wavelength (e.g., 355 nm) is greater than or equal to the workpiece extinction coefficient at the ultraviolet wavelength or that the base material extinction coefficient at an ultraviolet wavelength (e.g., 355 nm) is equal to or greater than 20 cm⁻¹. Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicants submit that Claims 10-12 are non-obvious.

Furthermore, the references do not disclose adhering an adhesive layer of a protective sheet to the incident side of a workpiece. *See Figure 1.* Hammann does not disclose a protection sheet with an adhesive layer and a base material. Therefore, the references combined do not teach the relative positions of the components recited in Claims 10-12.

The cited references do not inherently or expressly disclose that the base material density is greater than or equal to the workpiece density or is greater than or equal to 1.1 g/cm³. Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicants submit that Claims 13-14 are non-obvious over the cited references.

The cited references do not inherently or expressly disclose that the protective sheet tensile strength is greater than or equal to the workpiece tensile strength or is greater than or equal to 100 MPa. Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicants submit that Claims 15-16 are non-obvious over the cited references.

The cited references do not inherently or expressly disclose that the base material specific heat is greater than or equal to the workpiece specific heat. Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicants submit that Claim 17 is non-obvious over the cited references.

Application No.: 10/584,825
Filing Date.: June 26, 2006

The cited references do not inherently or expressly disclose that the workpiece is organic. Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicants submit that Claims 20 and 22 are non-obvious over the cited references.

The cited references do not inherently or expressly disclose that the refractive index of the base material at wavelength 546 is greater than or equal to the organic workpiece refractive index at 546 nm or is greater than or equal to 1.53. Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicants submit that Claims 20-21 are non-obvious over the cited references.

The cited references do not inherently or expressly disclose that the base material coupling energy is less than or equal to the workpiece coupling energy or is less than or equal to 800 kJ/mol. Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicants submit that Claims 22-23 are non-obvious over the cited references.

No Disclaimers or Disavowals

Although the present communication may include alterations to the application or claims, or characterizations of claim scope or referenced art, the Applicants are not conceding in this application that previously pending claims are not patentable over the cited references. Rather, any alterations or characterizations are being made to facilitate expeditious prosecution of this application. The Applicants reserve the right to pursue at a later date any previously pending or other broader or narrower claims that capture any subject matter supported by the present disclosure, including subject matter found to be specifically disclaimed herein or by any prior prosecution. Accordingly, reviewers of this or any parent, child or related prosecution history shall not reasonably infer that the Applicants have made any disclaimers or disavowals of any subject matter supported by the present application.

Application No.: 10/584,825
Filing Date.: June 26, 2006

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 21-Dec-07

By: 
Kerry Taylor
Registration No. 43,947
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20995
(619) 235-8550

4663245
121707